#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS MARSHALL DIVISION

COMMIL USA, LLC	§	
	§	
VS.	§	CASE NO. 2:07-CV-341-CE
	§	
CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.	§	

#### **VERDICT FORM**

# **QUESTION NO. 1:**

Do you find that Commil has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Cisco has directly infringed claims 1, 4, and 6 of U.S. Patent No. 6,430,395 ("the '395 patent")?

For Cisco's accused products, answer "Yes" or "No" for each claim.

# **QUESTION NO. 2:**

Do you find that Commil has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Cisco has induced infringement of claims 1, 4, and 6 of U.S. Patent No. 6,430,395 ("the '395 patent")?

For Cisco's accused products, answer "Yes" or "No" for each claim.

Claim 1: 

Claim 4: 

Claim 6: 

O

Claim 6:

# **QUESTION NO. 3**

Do you find that Cisco has proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that any of the following claims of the '395 patent are invalid for lack of enablement or for failure to satisfy the written description requirement? "Yes" means the claims are invalid, and "No" means the claims are not invalid.

A.	Because it is not enabled?
	Answer "Yes" or "No" for each claim.
	Claim 1:
	Claim 4:
	Claim 6:
B.	Because it lacks a sufficient written description?
	Answer "Yes" or "No" for each claim.
	Claim 1:  0
	Claim 4:
	Claim 6: NO

If you have found any of the claims infringed and valid (i.e., you have answered "yes" to any of the claims in question numbers 1 or 2 and "no" to both sections of question number 3 for the corresponding claim), then answer question number 4. Otherwise, do not answer the following question; the jury foreperson should instead sign and date this Verdict Form and return it to the Security Officer.

#### **QUESTION NO. 4:**

What sum of money, if any, if paid now in cash, would fairly and reasonably compensate the plaintiff as a reasonable royalty for any infringement you have found?

Answer in dollars and cents, if any, for a reasonable royalty.

Answer: #3,726,207.

Signed this 1 day of May, 2010.